

August 21, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 4243

I would encourage my colleagues and their constituents and friends to visit this unique and intriguing museum at the first opportunity, and would like to include in the Record the following description of it by Maryland's own Anne Christmas which appeared in the travel section of the New York Times of August 13, 1967:

A NEW MARYLAND MUSEUM DOWN ON THE FARM

(By Anne Christmas)

WESTMINSTER, Md.—A 19th-century farm filled with relics of a nearly forgotten era is the setting for the Carroll County Farm Museum, one of Maryland's newest tourist attractions.

The story of how the museum came into being is an interesting one. Some years ago, residents of Westminster noted that subdivisions were encroaching rapidly around a beautiful 142-acre tract of county-owned land within the city limits. This last bit of farmland inside Westminster was known as "The Old Folks Home," and, when its inhabitants dwindled to six, the facility was phased out.

This left the place unoccupied, and an immediate target for real-estate developers. They envisioned an extension of the attractive communities already flanking the property's boundaries.

The Carroll County Commission named a Citizens Committee to establish a farm museum to preserve some memories of the area's rich agricultural heritage—"Just in case a generation might grow up without being able to recognize a plow, or even a cow," as one of the group commented.

BANK BARN

The buildings of "The Old Folks Home" were well suited to the project. The key structure was a bank barn, which ranks among Maryland's best examples of early 19th-century construction. A series of rooms—they are built along one side of the barn to serve as a dormitory—was ideal for small exhibits of farm crafts, such as spinning, butterchurning, weaving, chair-caning and baking.

The main house, somewhat dreary and in need of refurbishing when the museum's board of governors inherited it in 1965, nonetheless was stoutly built with classically simple lines. Its 30 rooms underwent a major overhaul last year.

Most of the rooms of this typical farm dwelling are now open to the public for the first time. Many a Maryland attic was raided and many a long hour was spent by antiques buffs in acquiring furniture suitable for the house.

QUAINT KITCHEN

The Citizens Committee is particularly pleased with the results it has produced in setting up a quaint old kitchen. Items there include fireplace implements, a dough box, a hutch cupboard and ladderback chairs.

A child's bedroom has a four-poster walnut bed and a complete set of 19th-century doll furniture. Two other bedrooms, the customary "summer kitchen" and a bake-oven room recently were furnished with suitable antiques and opened for inspection by visitors.

Most of the land in surrounding Carroll County is used for growing corn, wheat and hay, with beef and dairy cattle as important byproducts. In keeping with local custom, the farm museum's acreage has been planted in grass, along with demonstration crops of wheat, corn, tobacco, buckwheat and broom-corn.

Before its formal opening last summer, the museum received some 1,000 articles from 200 individuals and organizations. Now that the farm is open regularly each weekend and holidays, many more people have

become interested in contributing antiques and farm memorabilia.

One of its treasures is a wagon that was one of the first to deliver mail in Carroll County, where rural free delivery was begun in 1899. Also in the barn area are early reapers, threshing machines, furrow and shovel plows, harnesses, oxen-yokes and carriages.

Implements for shoeing horses, making brooms, quilting, woodworking and the like also are on view every weekend throughout the season, which ends Oct. 31. Visiting hours are noon until 7 P.M. during August, and from noon to 5 P.M. in September and October. Admission is 75 cents for adults and 25 cents for children between 12 and 18 years old.

CRAFT DAYS

In addition, on "craft days" experts in many of these nearly forgotten arts are on hand to show how the pioneers performed these tasks. Dates for such demonstrations are next Saturday, when the accent will be on threshing and tobacco harvesting; Sept. 7-10, when the Mason-Dixon Steam Society holds its annual show, and Oct. 14, when "Fall Harvest Day" will attract thousands of visitors to enjoy Maryland's spectacular autumn foliage, as well as the farm operations.

Westminster is only 35 miles from Baltimore, and can be reached by taking the Baltimore Beltway (Interstate 695) west to the Pikesville-Reisterstown exit and then U.S. 140. The highway goes through some glorious open land, including Green Spring Valley, Maryland's most beautiful fox-hunting country.

The village of Glyndon, only a mile or two east for Reisterstown on U.S. 140, is the home of the Maryland Hunt Cup each April. Many enthusiasts of timber racing make a special trip there to view the tremendous fences on the course, which is regarded as one of the most difficult steeplechase tests in the world.

Corn Price Drop—What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the following is an editorial which appeared in the August 13 issue of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil. It points out what a 30-cent drop in the price of corn means to the people in a single county. Multiply this by the hundreds of counties in the Midwest. The effect on the people is disastrous.

I think the article is very thought-provoking and deserves the attention of the Members of the House:

IT WILL MEAN \$5.1 MILLION LESS

"Okay," says the city guy. "So the price of corn is down. What do I care? What does it mean to me?"

Maybe this is right. Maybe so few people live and work on farms any more that the price received for farm products is of little interest. So let's put the whole situation in a different light to try to draw attention to what is a very real problem.

Pottawattamie County is expected to produce about 17 million bushels of corn in 1967. The price of corn when the new harvest starts, about 60 days from now, is certain to be 30 cents below the level of last year. That means that the corn crop will be worth \$5.1 million less than if last year's prices had prevailed.

Farmers are accustomed to being pushed around so although there will be some grumbling and criticism, little will be heard about it. But what if the same kind of income drop were to be sustained by our wage-earners. What if 5,100 of the salaried men of this county were to be notified that they were going to receive \$1,000 each less this year than last for the same amount of work?

Would this raise the roof? You bet it would. These 5,100 wage-earners would represent about 25 per cent of the families in this county and this kind of income reduction would mean consternation.

Or to spread the drop in income even farther, if 10,200 workers were to have their earnings reduced by \$500 per year each, the resulting decline in economic activity in this county would be the same as the projected decrease in corn prices. Would this be worth a lot of comment? You know it would; in fact we might have some riots of our own right here.

Why then should the farmer have to take this kind of cut in earnings without squawking? He shouldn't. He ought to raise Cain and keep raising it until something is done. As far as we are concerned, he has a lot more to complain about than most of the people who are keeping the country in a state of pandemonium right now.

Crash Regimentation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1967

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues will enjoy and appreciate an editorial entitled "Crash Regimentation?" which appeared recently in the Des Plaines Valley News.

The editorial follows:

[From the Des Plaines Valley News, July 27, 1967]

CRASH REGIMENTATION?

No one seems to be paying attention to all the latest crash legislation (regimentation?) imposed on us by Congress lately.

The stock market goes down. "Crash" investigations and profit margins are hastily imposed by Federal Bureaus. It goes up and "crash" inflation practices and scrutiny is ordered by FTC.

Two giant firms attempt to merge. "Crash" rulings are ordered to halt the practice.

Rail workers go on strike. Nothing happens until they do, then "Crash" rulings are passed prohibiting this practice.

Two planes crash. Congress hurriedly orders a "Crash" investigation on the incident. It does this after every such plane crash.

An attorney writes a book about auto safety. Congress hurriedly holds hearings to investigate and make rulings. Another author writes about the effects of chemical insect control, so to the rescue comes a Federal Bureau with a crash program.

Conditions in large cities cause riots. So crash rulings are sought to forbid such practices.

College students take to LSD, so national legislation is asked to end that practice.

Cigarette smoking is connected with cancer somehow. So a Federal Bureau orders warnings on all packages (sales continue to climb) and now seeks to have equal time with each commercial on that product.

The population increases. Bureaus hurriedly pass out information pamphlets and birth control pills.

A4244

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 21, 1967

A fist fight occurs in Africa. Suddenly huge U.S. transport planes appear over that place. Israel forces damage all of the Arabian tanks rolling to invade their borders. Somehow a U.S. communications ship "happens" to be there (to protect citizens that have been evacuated earlier naturally) and is damaged.

Teachers strike and national rulings are sought to halt the practice. Truckers strike, so more rulings are sought.

Note that in each incident or case, the "crash" legislation had been imposed following the act rather than trying to find out just what had caused the incident.

It's just like firemen seeking to outlaw fires without seeking their causes. If an evil must build up to the point that a disaster occurs, the method has been to outlaw the fire rather than seek its cause.

The threads of federal regimentation are like those of a spider web. The fly cannot see the web until snagged and removed from society.

"Crash" legislation leaves no time for careful thought, analysis or deliberation. It calls for dictatorship (do this or else laws) hastily imposed.

Many will argue that "crash" legislation has accomplished some good. Perhaps it has, but at what price in dictatorship? And has it cured the problem or its causes?

Note that our apathy toward the disaster lies dormant until the cancer occurs, causing awareness and fear; so federal laws are asked and the causes of the disaster still remain in need of treatment.

Currently, a "crash" extra six percent federal income surtax is sought besides all those taxes imposed by the state legislature effective August 1.

Praise for Percy Housing Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1967

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, recently the Cincinnati Enquirer commented editorially on a bill introduced in the Senate by my friend from Illinois, Senator CHARLES H. PERCY, and cosponsored in the House by me. I commend the editorial to the attention of all.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Aug. 13, 1967]

WHY OVERLOOK THE PERCY PLAN?

Administration supporters in Congress are engaged in a flurry of activity to step up the flow of Federal aid to the nation's big cities—and in particular to its low-income inhabitants. None, however, has given more than passing attention to the most ingenious formula of its kind to find its way into the legislative hopper in many years.

One reason may be that its author is Sen. Charles H. Percy (R., Ill.), who has performed the remarkable feat of enlisting every Senate Republican as a cosponsor.

Another may be that, unlike most legislative proposals in the field, the Percy plan leans almost exclusively upon private enterprise rather than government.

What Senator Percy is advocating, specifically, is the establishment of a National Home Ownership Foundation to provide millions of low-income Americans with the resources to buy their own homes as an alternative to being herded into public housing projects.

Briefly put, the National Home Ownership Foundation would raise as much as \$2 billion in private capital

guaranteed debentures. That capital would then be loaned to nonprofit associations to build or restore homes that could be sold at not more than \$12,500 on long-term loans at 3% interest. The taxpayers' share would be limited to subsidizing the 3% interest subsidy.

The benefits of the Percy program are obvious.

For one thing, it represents the only formula through which many low-income families can ever approach home ownership with the sense of pride and responsibility that generally accompanies it. Moving into a public housing project, by way of contrast, often commits such a large share of a low-income family's income that home ownership simply vanishes forever as a realizable goal.

For another, what Senator Percy proposes could be a prime factor in reclaiming substandard neighborhoods and making them habitable again.

Richard Cloward of Columbia University's School of Social Work cited some statistics in an appearance before the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions not long ago that create some serious doubts about the scope of existing Federal housing programs.

"Since the public housing program was legislated in 1933," Mr. Cloward notes, "some 600,000 low-income housing units have been built, but in the last 15 years urban renewal and highway construction alone have demolished 700,000 low-rental units. If we add to this figure the low-rental housing destroyed by various Federal mortgage and tax-abatement programs . . . it is estimated that probably one million low-income units have been destroyed in this 15-year period.

"In the same period, urban renewal has built at the most 100,000 new units. So, in a little more than three decades the net loss in low-income housing is probably about 250,000 units. . . . The same story has been repeated all over the nation: urban renewals that demolish low-income housing and new highways that run through the ghetto have compressed people further and further into fewer and fewer and worse and worse buildings."

I would take some expert exploration to determine precisely the extent to which Senator Percy's National Home Ownership Foundation could reverse the trends of the last three decades. But it seems a creative contribution to one of the nation's basic problems and deserves, as a result, considerably more attention than it has received to date.

Conference Report on S. 16

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1967

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly urge and hope that the House will speedily and overwhelmingly approve this conference report now before us on S. 16, which provides a more equitable and realistic extension of benefits to all our war veterans and their families.

This conference report represents a just compromise agreement of our persistent congressional efforts to enact reasonable legislation to justly liberalize pension benefits for older veterans and simultaneously extend the full range of our traditional wartime benefits to veterans of current military service.

In substance, Mr. Speaker, this conference bill will provide an average 5 percent greatly needed cost-of-living increase in pension benefits for veterans and their survivors of all wars; authorize full wartime benefits for Vietnam era veterans regardless of where they have served; increase subsistence allowances for veterans in college; initiate urgently-required job training programs, and extend the Veterans' Administration home loan guarantee program for World War II veterans for 3 years. There are several other provisions designed to improve and balance our veterans benefits program that have already been fully and carefully explained by the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and that need no further recitation.

Mr. Speaker, in accord with the advocacy of myself and a great many other Members of the House, I am gratified for the pledge inherent in this bill and emphasized by our esteemed committee chairman that action will be taken in the immediate future, in avoidance of some past confusion and misunderstanding, to insure that any increases we may grant in social security payments will not deprive veterans and their widows and their families of any of the benefits authorized in this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps there has never been a more opportune time in our history for this Nation and this Congress to demonstrate consciousness of the moral obligation we have and the patriotic concern we feel toward our veterans and their families. Let us, then, recognize this opportunity and promptly approve this bill in the national interest.

Abba Eban
Abba Eban Sums Up 5-Week
Mideast Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, 1967, Israel's Foreign Minister, Abba Eban, presented his final speech before the General Assembly of the United Nations on the present crisis in the Middle East.

While the Arabs are presently being rearmed and are threatening to bring war once again to the Middle East, Abba Eban continued to stress Israel's wish for a just and lasting peace.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the full text of Foreign Minister Abba Eban's speech which appeared in the July 27, 1967, issue of the American Examiner.

The text follows:

ABBA EBAN SUMS UP 5-WEEK MIDEAST
DEBATE

NOT AN ACT OF ABDICATION

Israel leaves the General Assembly with strengthened resolve to work for the attainment of a just and durable peace. The Assembly has had many moments of tension and even of vehemence. But there is no rea-

August 21, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 4245

son to regard the result as one of paralysis. The rejection of unjust and intemperate charges against a Member State is not an act of abdication; it is an act of considered judgment.

Despite the intense and powerful pressure brought to bear upon it, the General Assembly has declined to violate justice or to betray truth. Thus, it has refused to misrepresent Israel's fight for survival as "aggression." A majority of its Members have seen the recent hostilities, in the long and sombre context of the events which preceded them. Nineteen years of implacable hostility reached a climax in May 1967, when a small State found itself encircled, besieged, blockaded and openly menaced with destruction.

Nothing in contemporary history is comparable with the intense and virulent belligerency which has beset Israel in the first two decades of its independence. No other State in our time has been required to live on such a slender margin of security or in the shadow of such a constant threat. When the noose was tightened around its neck two months ago, Israel's lonely resistance became the only alternative to a disaster which would have weighed intolerably upon the conscience of mankind. For if the openly avowed plan of Israel's extinction had succeeded, there would have been nothing practical for the United Nations now to discuss. Israel has in fact been denounced here by its adversaries for having energetically refused to die. The solid majority votes, first in the Security Council and then in the General Assembly, against the charge of Israeli aggression, bear witness to the inherent sense of justice and truth which has swept across world opinion and found its echoes in this hall.

TWO PROBLEMS

The central theme discussed at this session has been the relationship between two problems: the withdrawal of forces and the establishment of peace. The Soviet Union, the Arab States and those closely associated with them, have sought to establish a separation between these two concepts. Nearly all other Members of the General Assembly declined to endorse this separation. They saw the two issues as integrally and inseparably linked. They understood the dangers of restoring the situation which had given rise to active hostilities. For there would have been no Middle Eastern crisis had not Israel's right to peace, to security, to sovereignty, to economic development and to maritime freedom been forcibly denied and aggressively attacked. It is impossible to eliminate the symptoms of the Middle Eastern tension while leaving its basic causes intact.

That is the central lesson of this Assembly for Middle Eastern States. The lesson is plain: Member States which maintain a doctrine and practice of war against another Member State cannot receive from the United Nations the help and consideration which they could otherwise expect.

PRINCIPAL OF PEACE REJECTED

The General Assembly session has ended as it has for one reason alone: that Arab States and other refuse to tolerate any resolution which speaks seriously of peace. That is the only reason why no resolution of a substantive character could be adopted. If the Arab States accept the principles of peace, there can be not only resolutions, but, what is more important, solutions.

There have been many efforts in recent years to maintain a minimal tranquillity, even within the context of Arab belligerency. We operated with those efforts right up to 1967. It is now evident that such efforts cannot long succeed. There is no method of avoiding a constant brooding tension, with constant danger of explosion, unless one condition is fulfilled. The condition is that all Middle Eastern States render, each to the other, the full rights which States possess under the Charter to which we are all signatories.

U.N. CHARTER

Under the Charter, Israel's neighbours owe it the full recognition of its independence and statehood. Under the Charter, all Israel's neighbours are committed to refrain from the use of threat or use force against that Statehood and that independence. Under the Charter, all Arab States are bound to regard Israel as a State endowed with sovereignty equal to their own. Under the Charter, they are pledged to practice tolerance and live together with Israel as good neighbours, and to harmonize their efforts with Israel's for the maintenance of international peace and security.

These are the principles of the Charter. These are the accepted principles of international coexistence and of regional security. These are the principles which govern the American hemispheric system and other systems of peaceful regional security and co-operation.

Can anyone imagine that if Israel's neighbours had guided their relations with Israel by these principles we should be faced today with a crisis which still afflicts the Middle East and darkens the world? The strict application of Charter relationship between sovereign States is the beginning and the end of international wisdom in the Middle East. The replacement of the doctrine and practice of war by the doctrine and practice of peace is the central issue. I repeat: the replacement of the doctrine and practice of war by the doctrine and practice of peace is the central issue. It cannot be evaded. It cannot be sidetracked.

PEACE INSTEAD OF BELLIGERENCY

If it faced and solved, all other problems fall into place. For if there is peace instead of belligerency, such problems as the determination of agreed frontiers, the disengagement of forces, abstention from the threat of constant violence, and the normal use of international waterways all find their solution through the processes of peaceful settlement which the Charter prescribes. It is impressive to notice and to record how great a body of opinion exists in favour of attempting not a return to insecurity, nor a temporary palliative, but a radical and permanent remedy.

TIME HAS COME

Once the Arab States acknowledge to Israel those rights which all other Member States acknowledge to each other, the foundations of a peaceful Middle East will become firmly laid. The time has come—indeed, it is long overdue—to adapt the Arab-Israeli relationship to the accepted rules of international conduct amongst sovereign States. Many delegations have understood and affirmed that Israel's neighbours cannot at one and the same time deny its sovereignty, threaten its existence and refuse its basic rights to peace and security while demanding that Israel respect their sovereignty, their existence and their rights. The key to the Middle Eastern future therefore lies in the principle of reciprocity. Those who respect Israel's sovereign interests and rights will encounter from Israel a reciprocal respect of their rights and their interests.

It remains for me to discuss the application of these principles to the tasks which lie ahead. The cease-fire has been instituted. It must be meticulously observed. Agreed arrangements for its supervision are in force. But the cease-fire is, of course, an interim situation. It should be replaced as soon as possible by an agreed and viable peace ensuring security for all States. Peace should be negotiated freely between the parties in accordance with the procedures of pacific settlement prescribed in our Charter.

ISRAEL STANDS READY

Israel stands ready to negotiate a peace settlement with Egypt, with Jordan, with Syria and with Lebanon. In such negotiations all parties are free to present and examine any proposals in an effort to reach mutual agreement.

In addition to the issues, which lie within the responsibility of Middle Eastern States, there are universal religious interests which demand satisfaction and respect and which should be settled in consultation with those directly concerned. It is our hope and our policy that universal spiritual concerns in the Holy City will find agreed expression.

The war of 1948 and the subsequent belligerency have created and perpetuated humanitarian problems whose solution, as experience shows, can, only be achieved in the context of normal inter-State relations. Hundreds of thousands of people—Arabs and Jews—have been affected by the population movements generated by two decades of war, belligerency and hostility. The lesson of experience is clear. The conditions necessary to transform homeless refugees into productive members of society can reach full expression only if there is peace. A situation in which States are arrayed and embattled against each other; in which the violent destruction of one State is the avowed policy of others; in which an armaments race consumes scarce economic resources; in which refugees are envisaged by certain Governments as a spearhead for the destruction of a sovereign State—such a situation is not one in which Government and international agencies can successfully undertake enterprises of resettlement. Indeed, the clearest of lesson of experience after twenty tormented years is that nothing in Arab-Israeli relations is soluble without peace, while everything is soluble with it.

While the main responsibility falls on sovereign States within our region, States outside the Middle East, especially the most powerful amongst them, can do much to affect our destiny for good or for ill. They can affect it for good by respecting the policy of non-intervention; by making an equal distribution of their friendship; by avoiding any identification with hostility; by giving no indulgence to belligerency; and by concerting their action with the States of our region for the promotion of peace and welfare.

UNIVERSAL HUMAN DESTINY

It was, after all, in the Middle East in ancient times that the idea of a universal human destiny was expressed with incomparable force. It is there, more than anywhere else, that the need is compelling for a new atmosphere of relations on the international plane. Such new relationships are urgently needed for the highest human ends. There should be in the Middle East no belligerents, no victors or vanquished, but only the vision of peoples who have suffered greatly through the errors and illusions of those who have rejected peace as though it were an alien and forbidden word, to be banished from the international vocabulary. For the sake of countless people in the Middle East for whom there is no answer but peace, the world community should continue to set its face against the tensions and rancours of the past two decades. It is in our region that statemanship now faces its heaviest challenge and its brightest opportunity. To meet the challenge and to fulfill the opportunity will require the utmost dedication of our hearts and minds.

Soviet Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as is the case in any undertaking of such vast proportions, the U.S.

August 21, 1967

foreign aid program has suffered its share of abuse over the years, and inevitably many mistakes have been made during the course of our expenditures abroad. Nevertheless, an examination of the history of the last two decades shows an impressive list of accomplishments which have resulted from our international involvement.

West Berlin, Greece, and Korea mark major victories against Russian attempts at forced communization. Out of 44 countries in which there have been Communist attempts at takeovers, only six have actually turned Communist. This is a remarkable record. Overall, in view of what the world would look like today if we had pursued a policy of contented isolationism, I think we must clude that our investment has been very worthwhile.

I am including for the RECORD an article from Time magazine on Russian foreign policy since World War II which I commend to the attention of all those who are interested in the foreign aid program. It documents clearly the many beneficial effects that U.S. military and monetary assistance abroad has had.

THE UNEVEN RECORD OF SOVIET DIPLOMACY

In the past two decades, Soviet foreign policy has proved consistently costly, dangerous and in large measure ineffectual. After World War II, the Soviet Union scored tremendous gains, principally the Communization of Eastern Europe accomplished by the Red army. In due course, the West was compelled to acknowledge these gains and stop thinking about "rolling back" Communism. On the other hand, Moscow's grip on its satellites grew dramatically weaker. And beyond its original World War II conquests, Moscow won virtually nothing in the way of further Communist takeovers, with the sole exception of Cuba. Quite apart from Communism, Russia has achieved far less than it has often been credited with in the more conventional, big-power style of spreading influence, particularly in the "third world," where its potential had once seemed so menacing.

In almost every direct postwar confrontation with the West, Moscow backed off or down. Major milestones:

Iran. When Stalin refused to withdraw Soviet troops from the country's northern tier after World War II, U.S. and British pressure, backed by the West's monopoly on nuclear arms, forced their unconditional evacuation in 1946.

Greece & Turkey. Both nations faced takeover in 1947—Greece from a savage struggle with Communist guerrillas, Turkey from Russian pressure to annex its northeastern territories and thereby force joint sovereignty over the strategic Bosphorus and Dardanelles. The Truman Doctrine was chiefly responsible for thwarting Moscow's goals in both countries.

Berlin. Moscow did its best to squeeze the Allies (U.S., Britain, France) out of West Berlin with the blockade in 1948-49. Truman's characteristically spunky reply was the airlift, and another Soviet defeat. Again in 1959, after Nikita Khrushchev launched his rocket-rattling "breakthrough" policy, the Russians began threatening to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany, thereby isolating and possibly dooming West Berlin. The threat to Berlin, repeated in 1960 and 1962, was defused by U.S. troop reinforcements. The building of the Wall in 1961 to choke off the flow of escapees was tacit admission of failure.

Korea. Stalin thought that the southern half of the divided country—a scant 120 miles from Japan—was ripe for plucking in 1950. Truman's decision to intervene, with

United Nations support, frustrated that attempt. While Korea was no victory for the U.S., the stalemate that resulted prevented the Russians from achieving their original objective.

Cuba. In the cold war's tautest showdown, John F. Kennedy forced Khrushchev's hand by demanding the removal of Soviet missiles from the Caribbean. Faced with the alternative of nuclear war, Khrushchev caved in.

Viet Nam. Though the U.S. is deeply and painfully embroiled in Viet Nam, the Southeast Asian war has yielded scant prospect of benefit for Moscow either. Kossygin and Communist Boss Leonid Brezhnev, reversing Khrushchev's policy of noninvolvement in Southeast Asia, began aiding Hanoi early in 1965, when a Viet Cong victory seemed imminent. Large-scale U.S. intervention thwarted their hopes of a quick, cheap victory and exposed Russia to the charge that it will retreat from its involvement in any war of national liberation if the stakes get too high.

Russia can take some comfort from the divisions inside the Western Alliance and some victories in minor skirmishes, such as the U.S. backdown on the U.N. payments issue. But perhaps the prime Soviet accomplishment in recent years is that, compared to the buccaneering days of Stalin, Russia has become respectable as a world power. At home it has shown a measure of liberalization, and a pragmatic concern with prosperity that tends to discourage foreign adventure. Abroad, it has shown discretion in staying off any major, nuclear East-West conflict. The 1966 Tashkent Declaration, in which Russia acted as mediator between warring India and Pakistan, symbolized this new Soviet international respectability. But Moscow has had great difficulty in translating this image into concrete influence, partly because it seems basically divided as to its ultimate aims. Is it to be a conventional big power with global responsibilities and trade interests, more or less unhampered by the old Marxist goal of world revolution? Or is it to compete with Peking in the expensive and increasingly futile business of spreading disorder and rebellion?

Russian leaders are torn between the two policies. As a result, Russia has made scant headway along either course. Certainly, the Soviet's client states have grown increasingly skeptical of Moscow's interest in their cherished "wars of liberation." By contrast, the overwhelming U.S. commitment to South Viet Nam has persuaded many nations in Asia and elsewhere that Washington is willing to support its commitments to the end.

Sixteenth Amendment Used as Weapon Against Sierra Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, CBS Radio, through its Los Angeles station KNX, has made some clear statements concerning the plight of the Sierra Club in its battle with the Internal Revenue Service. The IRS revoked its tax exemption as an educational institution, largely because it opposed the Department of the Interior proposal to build two dams on the Grand Canyon.

Mr. Robert P. Sutton discusses this issue in his radio editorial of July 25, 1967. He is vice president of CBS Radio.

THE THIRTY WORD WEAPON

Thirty words written in 1913 have now become a federal weapon to silence citizen groups. These 30 words are the 16th Amendment that created Federal Income tax.

In the millions of words that followed the first 30, Washington recognized that some groups operate in the public interest. It was agreed that their income should not be taxed. These are religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and educational organizations. They are not supposed to devote a "substantial" amount of their efforts to propaganda or lobbying. Apparently, it is all right to be "educational" but you can't spend a lot of time "propagandizing."

You can immediately see that the law is subject to a wide range of interpretation. What is "substantial" and what is not? What is the difference between "educating" and "propagandizing" or "lobbying"? These would be difficult questions for most people. However, they are not hard for the Internal Revenue Service as you shall see.

A few years ago, the Department of the Interior decided to build two dams in the Grand Canyon. They would have destroyed much of the primitive grandeur of that natural wonder. As usual, the Sierra Club stood up to fight for preservation of the Canyon.

We say, "as usual," because the Sierra Club is the leading conservationist group in America. It has been for years. Supported by many distinguished citizens, it has waged a constant battle to save America's God-given treasures. It does this by using the public media to tell the story of conservation. It has enlightened all of us about the glories of our natural heritage. And, at least for now, the battle it led to save the Grand Canyon, has been won.

The Sierra Club's reward for this has been two-fold. First, it has gained the gratitude of millions of Americans. Second, it has had its tax exemption revoked by the Internal Revenue Service.

By doing this, the federal government has frightened away much financial support for the Club. It has cut in half what money the Club does get to fight bureaucrats who either don't know or don't care about conservation.

Although the Club has been operating for years, Washington didn't move against it until the administration lost the Grand Canyon fight. The government might respond to this by trotting out Section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code. But, that will not answer the important questions here, such as: Why are legal technicalities being used against the Sierra Club after all these years? Why only the Sierra Club—why not the many other technical violators of the law? What is the exact definition of the words, "substantial," "educational," and, "propaganda" as used in the law?

Washington may be technically correct—and there is some doubt about this—but, if it is, this is a classic case of being right for the wrong reason. KNX urges you to write to your Congressman today. Demand that the tax-exempt status of the Sierra Club be restored.

Constructive Proposals of the GOP Governors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful and constructive statements on urban prob-